DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 176

AC 002 847

Final Report for Neighborhood Study Project.
Louisville Univ., Ky. University Coll.; Louisville Univ., Ky. Urban Studies Center.
Pub Date Jul 68
Note-26p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40
Descriptors-*Administrative Agencies, *Community Agencies (Public), *Community Study, *Manuals, Metropolitan Areas, *Neighborhood Improvement, Urban Renewal, Volunteers, Workshops

This report gives the background of the Neighborhood Study Project, conducted in Louisville, Kentucky, in the spring of 1968. The city at that time had lost the first round competition for the Model Cities Program, and although the morale of the target neighborhood residents had been damaged, some community leaders still were willing to support a neighborhood improvement project. Even when the Neighborhood Council rejected participation in the second government Model Cities Planning, members were determined to solve their community problems of jobs, housing, and education through active community involvement and existing governmental and private service agencies. The project consisted of a series of related neighborhood workshops for persons in the target poverty communities. The purposes and results of the workshop were: examining the elements necessary to a successful neighborhood organization; examining techniques of integrating neighborhood organizations into the urban regional governmental complex; and preparing and publishing a manual of neighborhood organization designed especially for the Louisville Metropolitan Region. (se)

ED029176

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# FINAL REPORT FOR

# NEIGHBORHOOD STUDY PROJECT

University of Louisville
Urban Studies Center
Louisville, Kentucky 40208

University College
Louisville, Kentucky 40208

Projector Director
Joseph F. Maloney
July 1968

A CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY AS THE STATE AGENCY FOR ADMINISTRATION OF TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 IN KENTUCKY

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY 40208

URBAN STUDIES CENTER

(502) 636-4496

August 15, 1968

Mr. Jon Groteluschen
State Agency for the Administration of Title I
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

Dear Mr. Groteluschen:

The report herewith transmitted is a summary of the activities carried out under the Neighborhood Study Project. Appended are a group of the working papers used in the workshop series.

The draft of the manual for neighborhood self-organization developed as a result of this activity is separate from this project report.

The entire project could never have come to fruition without the hours of activity and participation on the part of over one hundred and fifty residents in the two neighborhoods. We promised nothing but hard work. They responded with dedication.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph F. Maloney

Joseph F. Maloney
Director

JFM:T

On The Basic Outline Of The Project

The objectives stated in the original proposal for this project were to organize and conduct a series of related workshops in neighborhoods and localized community self-organization with the consequent production of a manual specially designed for use in the Falls of the Ohio Metropolitan Region and adjacent counties in Kentucky. The proposal further provided that:

> "The project will also be the basis for intensive neighborhood organizational efforts in practical application and exercise of the principles developed and explored during the workshops. Insofar as feasible, special attention also will be given to neighborhood self-organization efforts to be incorporated into the resident-participation element in the planning phase of Louisville's Model City Program."

Project purposes were specified as follows:

1. To examine the elements necessary in a successful neighborhood organization.
2. To train residents of the officially projected Model City neighborhoods, private agency and organization staffs and others to develop and work with neighborhood and other community organizations. Approximately fifty such trainees will be selected because of their potential role in Model City Program activities and forty because of their potential role in other neighborhood and community self-organization efforts in the metropolitan region.

3. To develop techniques of integrating neighborhood organization into the urban regional governmental complex.

4. Prepare and publish a manual of neighborhood organization designed especially for the Falls of the Ohio Metropolitan Region.

Louisville's loss in the first round competition for Model City Program grants damaged the morale of target neighborhood residents but many leaders have maintained a willingness to support the neighborhood project. Support has been based on two factors:

1. the prospect of submitting a successful application for funds to win in the second competitive round for Model City funds and

2. the prospect of increasing neighborhood organization and the capacity to develop applications for improvement funds from other governmental and private sources.

The development of the purpose of neighborhood resident participation in "model-city-like" self-organization and planning became evident in the workshops and this idea was reflected in action taken by one of the Neighborhood Councils. However, the Neighborhood Council did reject participation in Model City Planning. On April 1, 1968, the Manly Area Council adopted the following resolution regarding the Model Cities Program.

"Be it resolved that the Manly Area Council, while approving the basic idea of Model Cities, rejects the proposal that

Louisville apply for such funds at this time. The following reasons are offered in support of this decision:

1. The questionable availability of proper funding

2. The desire to avoid fruitless participation.

3. The determination to solve, through active community involvement, the problems of jobs, housing, and education through existing governmental and private service agencies."

On April 9, 1968, Mayor Kenneth A. Schmied announced that Louisville would not seek to become a "model city" in second-round competition. In view of these developments, given above, a shift in focus of the project was necessary and requires shifts in the work program but the fundamental purposes of the project was not changed.

The purpose of the Neighborhood Project was to:

1. Examine the elements necessary in a successful neighborhood organization.

2. Develop techniques of integrating neighborhood organizations into the urban regional governmental complex.

3. Prepare and publish a manual of neighborhood organization designed especially for the Falls of the Ohio Metropolitan Region.

There was a required shift in emphasis on whom the workshops were to involve. Since city agencies withdrew their support from the program and neighborhood residents outside of the earlier proposed target area had little preparation for mounting planning efforts, we escalated activity in the poverty target areas. Therefore, more intensive effort was taken to involve residents in two of the poverty target neighborhoods served by Neighborhood Councils. Training present members of the Neighborhood Councils

and residents to develop and work with other neighborhood and community organizations was stressed.

The two neighborhood areas chosen had certain specific characteristics:

1. Both were in the original Model City Area
2. The Area Councils of the local Community Action Commission covering each neighborhood were receptive to the idea of this study and activity.
3. One neighborhood was in an Urban Renewal Area in the planning process. The other was adjacent to Urban Renewal in later stages of development.
4. The neighborhoods were not very far removed geographically as to approximate age of structures, nor age as to its role in this total community; but they were quite different in the 'community' outlook of the residents.

These characteristics allowed a differentiation of technique in going through the same procedures to examine the necessary elements of successful neighborhood organization, to train residents and to explore the relationships of this burgeoning organization with the various parts of this region's governmental complex through series of workshops.

Each group of participants established target area boundaries for their work and survey. In order to get moving, a consultant on inspection for housing code compliance was asked to aid in the development of a check-off inspection sheet to be used as a basis for a construction analysis of each house as to codes. Participants collected information on types and sites of all structures within the boundaries of the neighborhood under study. Planning maps (or "Target Neighborhood Planning Boards") of the areas under development styrofoam blocks for symbolic buildings represented the actual structures on the board. A

survey kit designed to yield detailed social and environmental profiles of the neighborhoods was developed.

Two devices were used to relate the abstract idea of 'neighborhood' to the 'place where we live'. 1) A film was made showing the streets, alleys, buildings and other 'points of interest' in the neighborhood. This provided a visual summary of the salient physical characteristics at the workshop meeting. 2) A 4' x 8' board with representations of a neighborhood and an accompanying verbal description of the various elements was used as a way of focusing participants' attention. Details of this are included as part of the appendix.

The use of Super-8 film as a tool in neighborhood work and activities was expanded in the project. This kind of film is relatively inexpensive as is the equipment (i.e. camera and projector). The visual impact of film that relates directly to the group and what they are concerned with and working on, even though of less than professional caliber, is tremendous.

The board as a basis for the game 'trade-off' was not fully developed in this project, although it should be explored at some future date under other conditions. It was felt that the use of the board mock-up was important, but that to have pushed to hard to complete the 'game' would have defeated the purpose of this project. The testing of ways to help residents self-organize does not mean that they must follow a rigid prescribed formula.

The descriptive survey of their neighborhood by the residents met various snags and delays in the Manly Area.

There were several possible contributing factors. One is the participants' efforts were diverted by the decision process of the Neighborhood Council concerning support of the proposal that Louisville apply for Model City funds.

A second factor contributing to the survey difficulty was resident apprehension about renewal plans and their ability to cope with them. One resident responded to an interviewer who has lived in the neighborhood for eighteen years by saying, "John, why do you ask me all of these questions? Are you working for Urban Renewal and planning to take my house from me?"

A third contributing factor was the participants' lack of skill in handling critical reactions from their nieghbors, such as above. They lacked skill in articulating their purpose and confronting their neighbors. One interviewer commented that: "It's hard to get them (residents) to understand what you want. People like me don't talk educated... It's hard to get them interested in what we are doing and help out. They have been sold out so many times."

A fourth factor may have been in the content of the survey kit questionnaire. It was demanding on the interviewers in terms of time; some interviewers mentioned the threatening quality of the questions and other inidcated that residents were not so much threatened by the question content as they were by the uncertainty that the interviewer and the project might not constitute a ruse for "urban removal" of their houses.

In the Jackson Area, this neighborhood survey aspect was handled in a different manner so that there could be a comparison and refinement of techniques. The group carried out an evolving discussion as to how they

would carry out their survey, what they would look for, how they might record their observations and then how they would report them at the next session so that the group could build on the board, a styrofoam representation of their neighborhood. Each resident then chose a block, usually the one in which he or she lived. It was decided that individuals would solicit help from others in the area so as to be sure that every aspect of the blocks in that neighborhood was covered.

Both neighborhood groups at this stage expressed concerns about the uncertainty of their activities in relation to changing anything. A basic question was asked, "Can we really influence anything or will others (meaning Urban Renewal, etc.) decide entirely what will happen in here." This question and the general feeling that planning activities by neighborhood residents are of no avail must be met and overcome if there is to be any real thrust to these types of activities. Success and the satisfaction that it can bring, if only on a minute scale, is the only valid answer.

At this middle point in the workshops, a concerted effort was put forth in both neighborhoods to interest more residents in being participants. In Jackson, handbills were distributed door-to-door. In Manly, the main reliance was on the Target Area office and the grape vine.

The death of Dr. Martin Luther King distorted the pattern of meetings in each neighborhood. Attendance dropped radically, even though the participants talked it over and did not want the meetings canceled. Subsequent to this early April break the pace again continued with increased members.

As the survey data came in, the board construction to represent the neighborhood continued. Both groups hesitated to deal physically with

the board pieces as to changes that might be possible to improve their specific neighborhood. It would be better if this is done again, to thoroughly explore and work through all the "trade-off" activities with a representative, but imaginary area first. People seem more comfortable with verbal tools. when to remove a block may look like removing a good neighbor.

Both groups tended to speak and react more against the forces such as Urban Renewal rather than to see ways in which positive actions could be taken by themselves as residents. This came much later in the project, although this ghost was never completely laid.

By discussion and observation of the board, the Manly Neighborhood zeroed in on a new street level expressway that is planned for one side of this neighborhood. They invited Urban Renewal officials to attend one of the meetings, in order to understand exactly what this agency had in mind or was doing as they collected land parcels for the right-of-way. This move to confront what what was happening in the area, rather than simply to react was interesting. While they could not change this particular highway, neither did they have to passively accept everything.

Their final decision was to expand activities into each block on the basis of block organizations. They thought and planned that this would take the summer to carry out. Next fall they can coordinate block efforts into further neighborhood activities.

The Jackson Neighborhood groups came up with a list of 18 'ideas for change" (see appendix). This was the result of a brain-storming session held when the board representation of their neighborhood was almost complete. Three of the items reflected their growing concern

and particularly their awareness of housing in the neighborhood.

As a result of the initial housing survey and the difficulties in knowing what makes a house standard or sub-standard, the Urban Studies Center had developed a film on this topic. The film followed an inspector through his activities and shows three houses in different parts of the city being condemned as it depicted the reasons why and what citizens could do to help.

This film was made part of a workshop session to which a housing inspector was invited. By the use of the film, the inspector did not have to make a speech, but could answer specific questions. This procedure was extremely constructive and should be followed whenever possible.

At the final task force meeting of the Jackson neighborhood group the participants they took over and projected their own activities for the future. They decided that a primary goal for them should be in the area of recreation. With this in view, they elected a group of officers and set up a meeting with recreation officials as the Urban Studies Center"s direct participation bowed out.

Conclusions-

This project had three main purposes, 1) to examine the necessary elements of successful neighborhood organization, 2) to develop techniques of integrating neighborhood organizations into the urban regional governmental complex; and, 3) to prepare and publish a manual of neighborhood organization especially for the Falls of the Ohio Metropolitan Region.

The elements of success can be best summarized as those things which provide satisfaction. When organization on a block or neighborhood level can provide a means of accomplishment for the individual and for the groups, it will continue to grow and prosper. Physical and concrete things such as "building blocks" or films can start a process that talk alone can not move.

Both groups were glad to start with things like the planning board, but they then moved to tackling issues on the verbal level. This came after they were comfortable with one another in the context of their planned activities.

Neighborhood organizations do, because of their voluntary nature retain an easy relationship with formal governmental structures and agencies. They have a voice that is greater than the sum of their individual citizens, but sometimes not as direct.

When the groups reached the level of being able to say, as a group, "this is the governmental area about which we have questinns first", they were shown how to ask an official of that agency to come and talk to them.

This kind of communication was the first level of integration between the neighborhood groups and governmental complex. This second level was starting as the project ended. That is, how to work with the agency to

accomplish a series of results that are satisfactory to both the neighborhood group and to the agency. This level has not been tested as yet with these groups.

The manual of neighborhood organizati on has been developed as a tool for a particular kind of person. It is not directed to the professional, although he may find it of interest. It is not directed to the entirely satisfied individual. It is directed to that person who is dissatisfied with his block, his neighborhood and his surroundings and who wants to know where and how to go about making those changes that will help not only himself but also the "stree where he lives" and its surroundings.

URBAN STUDIES CENTER -- UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE
NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION PROJECT

Fictional Neighborhood Description Of A Neighborhood Planning Board.

A. Physical Characteristics

The neighborhood is bordered on the north by the major shopping district of the city. The street on the eastern edge is a major public transportation artery leading to the downtown and links the area to a more middle class economic area to the south.

Many of the buildings are three floor brick construction that were built 75 to 85 years ago. A four year Catholic college is located on 14th Street and has been expanding. However, it is relatively surrounded by several apparently prosperous used car lots and car dealers.

The decline of the neighborhood and the resident lack of contact with each other is shown in the abandonment of the public school on Kent Street. The residents showed no signs of protest at the time the school was closed. The people in the neighborhood are seldom seen in Ben Park which is across the street from the abandoned school. It is an unequipped park without even trees or lighting for use at night. It is not unusual for muggings to happen in this or the surrounding neighborhood.

To the north of Ben Park the housing is largely unrenewable and as one moves west and north the dwellings are a mixture of unrenewable homes and rooming houses.

A Catholic Church is located on 16th Street which gives some anchorage to a neighborhood that has a higher proportion of home owners although it is surrounded by a business area and a more transient population. The business establishments along Elm Street (which borders the southern area) range from bars that have frequent police calls to a modern cafeteria and drug store.

B. Population Profile.

The neighborhood has a population of about 5,000. The average income of the neighborhood is estimated to be $3,000. The unemployment rate in the neighborhood is considered high with possibly more than 700 people without jobs.

The nearest school is three blocks southeast of 14th Street and Elm Street. It is known that there are a high number of dropouts but exact figures are not available. The average grade level achieved for the neighborhood is 8.6. It is reported that the younger and better teachers will not go into the surrounding schools. The high school is sometimes reported to graduate many persons performing lower than business and college expects from high school graduates

The T.B. rate is four times as great in this area as in the suburbs. V.D. is high and increasing. However, two outpatient clinics are within a distance of two miles. This is an area high in crime rate but study is required to determine the exact figures. The same can also be said of the proportion of the population that are welfare recipients.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE
URBAN STUDIES CENTER

1/25/68

NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION PROJECT

FICTIONAL DESCRIPTION OF NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING BOARD

(For: Manly Area Workshop No. 1)

A. Physical Characteristics

The neighborhood is bordered on the north by the major shopping district of the city. The street on the eastern edge is a major public transportation artery leading to the downtown and linking the area to a more middle class economic area to the south.

Many of the buildings are three floor brick construction built 75 to 85 years ago. A small proportion of these remain as single family homes. A large proportion of these buildings are converted apartments or rooming houses, and some have struggling shops at the first floor level.

A four year Catholic college is located on 14th Street and has been expanding. However, it is partially surrounded by several apparently prosperous used car lots and car dealers.

The decline of the neighborhood and the lack of contact among residents is shown in the abandonment of the public school on Kent Street. The residents showed no signs of protest at the time the school was closed.

The people in the neighborhood are seldom seen in Ben Park which is across the street from the abandoned school. The treeless park has no equipment and has no lighting for use at night. It is not unusual for muggings to happen in this or the surrounding neighborhood.

Immediately to the north of Ben Park the housing is largely unrenewable. As one moves west and north of the park, the dwellings are a mixture of unrenewable homes and rooming houses with rapidly deteriorating housing-but renewable.

A Catholic Church and elementary school are located on 16th Street at the southwest corner of the area. They give some anchorage to a neighborhood that has a higher proportion of home owners although it is surrounded by a more transient population and a not so prosperous commercial area. Home ownership is considered to be quite low throughout this whole area, however.

The business establishments along Elm Street (which borders the southern area) range from bars that have frequent police calls, to a modern cafeteria and a drug store. The largest single building on this street has been vacant for at least twenty years and is obviously beyond repair.

B. Population Profile.

The neighborhood has a population of about 3,500 to 4,000. The household average income of the residents is estimated to be $4,000. Slightly over 30% have an income of less than $3,000. The unemployment rate in the neighborhood is considered high, with possibly more than 325 people without jobs.

Almost 45% of the residents are less than 19 or over 64 years of age. There are approximately 650 school age children (ages 5 to 19). 380 children are reported to be on A.F.D.C. Resident ages are classified as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Under 5 | 275 |
| 5 - 19 | 650 |
| 20 - 64 | 2,100 |
| 65 | 700 |

Many children cross major arteries of traffic to reach school. A great number of them walk eight or more blocks to school--some to a school three blocks southeast of 14th Street and Elm Street.

It is known that there are a high number of dropouts from public schools but exact figures are not available. The average grade level achieved for the neighborhood is 8.6. It is reported that the younger and better teachers will not go into the surrounding schools. The high school is sometimes reported to graduate many persons performing lower than business and college expect from high school graduates.

The T. B. rate is four times as great in this area as in the suburbs. V. D. is high and increasing. However, two outpatient clinics are within a distance of two miles. This is an area high in crime rate but study is required to determine exact figures. The same can also be said of the proportion of the population that are welfare recipients.

December 1, 1967

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

URBAN STUDIES CENTER

Neighborhood Working Paper

Trade-off

The game is a table situation of neighborhood community planning.

Materials Needed

1. Large scale map of area to be considered - one block each 4" x 6"

2. Description of usages for each block
   what kind of buildings
   what used for (residences, businesses, occupancy)
   state of repair and age
   extent of coverage (land)
   number of occupants per unit average any special user characteristics (none for aged)

3. Descriptions of population
   - age profile
   - general income characteristics
   - educational needs and achievements

4. General information on business and industry in area
   - kinds
   - number employers (under or over needs)

Playing Procedure

1. First time activities are carried out using an imaginary neighborhood. Later when play is understood, a real neighborhood is studied.
2. Group sits down and considers any and all aspects of area. Any desired change may be made, that suits group. Building, torn down, moved or constructed, usages changed. The only aim is to have the best neighborhood possible for the residents and as it might relate to surrounding area. This latter is not stressed. The area worked with and the residents and workers are prime concern.

3. When all of the desired physical changes are made, referee notes the changes and styrofoam cubes are placed on board to represent actual buildings.

4. Players take a short break while referees confer over general figures for cost of changes made in each block or part changed.

5. Group disucssion now is directed to evaluating the changes. Players sit so they can see the board during this period. Leader works through the blocks one by one.

An arbitrary rule-of-thumb is that one rehabilitated housing unit is worth 10 points. All changes are related to this figure. (e.g. if ½ block is cleared for playground, what is this worth to the neighborhood? 5 points? 10 points - same as one rehabilitated housing unit? 100 points? 1,000 points?) Whatever value is decided upon is written down by the referee next to the description of the change. When all blocks are evaluated, the referees will have a list of changes, the probable "ball-park" cost of the change and the point valuation of the change assigned by the group.

At this point, general play takes a break.

6. The referees and the group leader add up the costs and point valuations and calculate the points/$1000 of the changes.

7. General discussion on game and results.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE
URBAN STUDIES CENTER

May 7, 1968

IDEAS FOR CHANGES -JACKSON AREA

1. Public Library open 6 nights
2. Shopping Center
3. Put shopping Center in Clarksdale
4. Swimming Pool on empty lot near Caldwell
6. Recreation Park
7. Restoration of all houses that need it
8. Clear dilapidated dwelling
9. Fill vacant lots (usefully) Redevelopment
10. Indoor Recreation - community center
11. Run by people in community center
12. Crusade for Library use.
13. Improve library - more books, etc.
14. Health Center
15. Art gallery in community center - with education facilities
16. Speed limits - check and improve
17. Play areas for children
18. Pressure on individuals in neighborhood to improve appearance of house, yard, buildings, etc.

1/24/68

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE
URBAN STUDIES CENTER

TITLE I NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION WORKSHOP PROJECT

# WHAT IS MY NEIGHBORHOOD?

No longer can we think of our neighborhood only in terms of neighbors whom we know well--who have known us since we were children. Americans have become too mobile, with at least a fourth of our families nationally moving each year. In some neighborhoods, if one had lived there two years, he would be an "old-timer." Also, we no longer depend chiefly on our neighbors to bail us out of trouble, when we are sick, when we have a death, or when we are "flat broke." In our impersonal society, governmental agencies and formally structured charitable organizations are supposed to do this. If we can no longer define "neighborhood" in terms of a neighbor being his brother's keeper, what can we use to define a neighborhood. Let us examine some elements which might assist us in defining our neighborhood. See if you agree that each one is essential.

## Geography

Definite boundaries. A neighborhood must be small enough to be thought of as an area where people can communicate easily. Therefore, it must be an area where people can get together easily. In most areas in the inner city this means that the whole area must be reached from any point with an easy walk. This means, also, that there cannot be a major barrier to travel such as a freeway or elevated train.

Similarity. There can be a wide diversity within a neighborhood but there must be enough in common for people to identify with the neighborhood and be familiar with it. This usually requires fairly limited boundaries.

People. A neighborhood which is alive takes for granted a great deal of contact among people and this means that they have many things in common--perhaps schools, churches, clubs, or family relationships. Even in the core of our cities we find some extended families, whose members are an active force binding together a neighborhood with a sense of community. Children are much better than adults in finding the frontiers of their community and learning who the other children are.

## Public Facilities

Common Activities. Public facilities such as schools, playgrounds, swimming pools, community centers, precinct police or fire stations, street tree planting, lighting, garbage collection schedules, street repair, or even election of public officials are items of common interest for people in a neighborhood. The once predominant factor of place of employment is not usually so important any more. When it was fashionable to walk home from the shop for lunch everyone in a neighborhood shared this economic enterprise. Today the rather

amusing or sorrowful spectacle exists of masses of people reversing location for work and residence. In many neighborhoods few people from there will work at the factory or office dominating its center. Thus public facilities and the community efforts to improve these through self initiative or pressure on the aldermen or school board are primary objects of modern neighborhoods.

Schools. Schools in the neighborhoods seem to be a center rallying point in most neighborhoods. The school gives each person, at least those with young children, a common interest. We are a child-oriented society and the hopes for our children frequently override our current concerns for ourselves.

Churches. Churches and synagogues have played important social roles in addition to spiritual roles in our neighborhoods. Evening and weekend educational services have given children and adults places to go and events to hold in common. Like the factories, some of the churches have ceased to be a meaningful neighborhood institution and have become declining bulks of congregations moved to the suburbs--hanging like empty locust shells on a lamp post. Fortunately, this trend appears to be reversing and in other cases new congregations better representing the current neighborhood have taken over the usable facilities of former congregations.

Stores Since the days when women shared a preferred rock in the creek on which to beat their clothing clean, the laundry has been a gathering place. Today's laundromat is just one of the retail stores which is necessary in a neighborhood. A grocery, a drug store, a variety store, and, perhaps a bar or an ice cream shop or bakery, frequently form a convenient cluster of services for the neighborhood. In neighborhoods with lots of cars the only surviving retailer might be a 7-11 grocery or a "mom and pop" grocery, but in neighborhoods depending on walking and public transportation a greater variety--if not size--of establishments is needed.

An Identity

Perhaps, the hardest of all of the qualities of a neighborhood to describe is the aspect of self identity. If a group of people do not see themselves as a neighborhood with common interests and a need to interact they remain just that--a group of people who live in the same general area. Some odd things give people a sense of neighborhood. A park or a school, a cluster of retail stores, a post office, or a manufacturing plant might serve as the identifying rallying point for people to group themselves into a neighborhood.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

I. What obvious geographic borders are there?
   a. East
   b. West
   c. South
   d. North

Are these physical barrier impassable?

Does a sense of community end right at the barrier?

If there are no physical barriers, on what basis would you draw the boundary?

a. School lines
b. Where usage changes (e. g. business to residential)
c. Where the nature of the residents change (from home owners relatively stable to cut-up large house with high rate of change of residents)
d. Other

II. What are the community services you have in common and need to keep tabs on?

A. Public Services
a. Street lights
b. Chuck holes in the street
c. Playgrounds
d. Garbage collection
e. Removing eyesores
f. Inspecting for fire hazards or zoning infractions
g. Schools
h. Street trees and parks
i. Curbs and sidewalks
j. Swimming pools or sprinkle hydrants
k. Police and fire protection
l. Community centers for all age groups
m. Library branch

B. Commercial Services
a. Retail stores
1. groceries
2. clothing
3. beverages
4. drugs
5. cleaners and launderers
6. laundromat
7. newspaper and magazine and novelties
8. bakery

b. Commercial entertainment
1. movie theater
2. bars
3. ice cream and soda shop
4. restaurant or cafeteria
5. pool hall

III. What role do the following institutions play in giving a feeling of neighborhood?

A. Schools
   1. Which one (s)? (in or out of the neighborhood boundary)
   2. What grade level?
   3. Active parents group?

B. Churches
   1. Which one (s)?
   2. What services do they provide?
   3. Do they reach non-church members?

C. Parks
   1. Are they places to congregate?
      a. all age groups
      b. only children
      c. only in the day
      d. never safe?

   2. Are they equipped?

   3. In general, are they a center for community life and identify.

IV. What other factors make this area a neighborhood?

Address _____

Type of Building:

____Brick
____Frame
Basement: Yes___ No___
Number of stories above ground_____
Single family dwelling: Yes____ No____

Number of rooms, not counting the bathroom, in your living unit____
Number of bedrooms_____

Number of people living in your unit_____Adults_____Children____
If children, how many boys____ Ages_____
girls____ Ages_____

Check any of the following items which apply to your living unit:

Wallpaper:
Loose____
Hanging_____

Plaster:
Broken____
Loose_____
Cracked____

Holes in
Walls_____
Ceilings___

Floors
Broken____
Sagging____

Public Hallways and/or Stairways:
No lighting_____
Present lighting inadequate_____

Basement in need of repair:
Inside steps_____
Inside door_____
Outside steps_____
Outside door_____

Plumbing:
No hot water heater_____
Inadequate hot water heater_____
Hot water heater not properly vented_____
Repairs needed on hot water heater_____

No kitchen sink_____
Sink not connected to
hot water line_____
cold water line_____
Sink in need of repair
Must share with another apt._____

Bathroom facilities:
No bathtub or shower_____
Bathtub or shower (whichever you have)
Not connected to hot water line_____
Not connected to cold water line_____
Not connected to sewer_____
Must share with another apt._____
In need of repair_____

No inside flush toilet
Outside toilet_____
Flush toilet
Not connected to cold water line___
Not connected to sewer_____
Must share with another apt._____
Bathtub or shower and inside flush toilet not enclosed (walls and ceiling) so as to afford privacy to users_____

No window or other means of ventilation in bathroom_____

No hand basin_____
Basin not connected to
hot water line_____
cold water line_____
Basin in need of repair_____

Sewer or drain lines clogged up or not operating effectively____
Water lines broken or leaking___
In need of repair_____

Gas lines broken or leaking_____
In need of repair_____

Space heaters not properly vented__
Heating system not properly vented_
Chimney in need of repair_____

Type of Building:



Windowpanes:
Broken_____
Missing____

One openable window in each room_____

Electricity
Wiring in need of repair_____
Less than two outlets in each room___
No separate outlet for kitchen_____

Rotten, loose, or broken
Window frames_____
Door frames_____
Joists and sills_____
Cornices_____
Window sash_____

Excessive accumulation of Garbage_____
Garbage_____
Rubbish_____

Improper disposal containers for
Garbage_____
Rubbish_____

High Grass and weeds_____

Pests_____
(Roaches, rodents, etc.)

Holes in foundation_____
Fascia board in need of repair replacement_____
Roofing in need of repair or replacement____
Inadequate gutters and downspouts to drain roof surfaces_____
Downspouts not connected to sewer_____

All outside openings not properly screened___

Food being cooked in a room used for sleeping purposes_____
Cooking stove being used for heating purposes_____

Living unit is rented_____
Amount of rent_____
Per month_____or Weekly_____

COMMENTS:_____

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE
URBAN STUDIES CENTER

# NEIGHBORHOOD STUDY PROJECT

Director - Joseph F. Maloney

Assistants - Clarence H. Amster

Landis W. Jones

William L. Husk

Rea T. Alsup

Thomas S. Jeffries

Research Assistants - Mrs. Agnes D. Livingood
Joe Bard
Charles Bartman
Mrs. Helene Zukof

ERIC Clearinghouse
OCT 3 1968
on Adult Education